

REMARKS

This Amendment is filed in connection with a Request for Continued Examination in response to the Final Office Action mailed Feb. 25, 2008 and the Advisory Action mailed May 21, 2007. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration. All objections and rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 1-28 are now pending in the case.

Claims 1, 5, 6-8, 11, 13-15, 18, 20-22, 25, 27 and 28 have been amended.

No new claims have been added.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

At paragraphs 19-26 of the Final Office Action, claims 1-5, 8-12, 15-19 and 22-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Yoneda et al., U.S. Publication No. 2007/0076703 (hereinafter “Yoneda”) in view of Bou-Diab et al., U.S. Publication No. 2006/0187950 (hereinafter “Bou-Diab”).

The Applicant’s claim 1, representative in part of the other rejected claims, sets forth (emphasis added):

1. (CURRENTLY AMENDED) A method for providing request compatibility in a multicast system, said method comprising:

receiving, by a layer 2 switch coupled between a group of receivers and a router, requests for traffic from said group of receivers;

determining, by said switch, whether said traffic requests contain incompatible request types;

if incompatible request types exist, then separating said traffic requests into at least two groups based on type; and

sending requests of different types to said router from different addresses of the layer 2 switch, to present an appearance to said router that the requests of different types are from different hosts.

Yoneda discusses using “both IP multicast and IP unicast in packet distribution.” See paragraph 0013. “[E]nd nodes check mutually whether or not other end nodes are capable of communicating in IP multicast. Then, end nodes use IP unicast in packet distribution to other end nodes not capable of communicating using only IP multicast.” See paragraph 0014. In one portion, Yoneda mentions that multicast may be conducted by a Source Specific Multicast (SSM) method or by an Any Source Multicast (ASM) method. See paragraph 0031. In another portion, Yoneda mentions that, if an end node receives packets forwarded according to a multicast distribution tree and cannot identify an IP address of a source from the packets, the end node inserts its own IP address into the packets as the source to avoid problems in the network. See paragraphs 84-85.

Bou-Diab discusses an architecture “for provisioning bundled high bandwidth multicast service over a packet switched communications network.” See abstract. Content is sent from “a super-head end content source 304 over a service provider’s network 300 shown in Fig. 3, to multiple distribution edge router network nodes 310-E.” See paragraph 0040. Bou-Diab briefly mentions IGMP, stating that “Ethernet switching tables at the edge switching nodes 310-E are built automatically via... IGMP (Internet Group Membership Protocol) snooping functionality.” See paragraph 0061.

The Applicant respectfully urges that both Yoneda and Bou-Diab are silent concerning the Applicant’s claimed *“sending requests of different types to said router from different addresses of the layer 2 switch, to present an appearance to said router that the requests of different types are from different hosts.”*

Prior networks have generally experiences incompatibility issues when an L2 switch attempted to aggregate multiple multicast requests of different types. For example, as described at paragraphs 0022 and 0023 of the specification, with prior techniques, if a router attempted to aggregate a single-source request (according to IGMP v3) and an any-source request (according to IGMP V2) an undesirable conflict would occur. The Applicant addresses this shortcoming of the prior art by *“sending requests of different types to said router from different addresses of the layer 2 switch, to present an appear-*

ance to said router that the requests of different types are from different hosts." For example, (see dependent claims 6 and 7) the Layer 2 switch may create a first host identity associated with a first MAC address and a second host identity with a second MAC address, to present the appearance to the router that the requests of different types are from different hosts, while they are actually from the same Layer 2 switch.

Neither Yoneda nor Bou-Diab suggest such novel operation. Yoneda simply discusses using unicast communication where end nodes are not capable of communicating with multicast. See Yoneda paragraphs 0013 and 0014. In the Final Office Action, the Examiner specifically points to paragraphs 82-85 of Yoneda in relation to sending requests of different types to a router from different addresses of the layer 2 switch. However, paragraphs 82-85 of Yoneda simply describe that, if an end node receives packets forwarded according to a multicast distribution tree and cannot identify an IP address of a source from the packets, then the end node inserts its own IP address into the packets as the source. Such passage in no way suggests *"sending requests of different types to said router from different addresses of the layer 2 switch, to present an appearance to said router that the requests of different types are from different hosts."*

Combination with Bou-Diab does not remedy the shortcomings of Yoneda. Bou-Diab simply discusses techniques for "bundled high bandwidth multicast service over a packet switched communications network" and sets out a network architecture. See abstract, paragraph 0040 and Fig. 3. Bou-Diab makes no mention of *"sending requests of different types to said router from different addresses of the layer 2 switch, to present an appearance to said router that the requests of different types are from different hosts."*

Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully urges that the combination of Yoneda and Bou-Diab is legally insufficient to make obvious the present claims under 35 U.S.C. §103.

At paragraphs 27-29 of the Final Office Action, claims 6, 7, 13, 14, 20, 21, 27 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Yoneda and Bou-Diab in further view of Gainer et al., U.S. Publication No. 2007/0121628 (hereinafter “Gainer”).

The Applicant notes that claims 6, 7, 13, 14, 20, 21, 27 and 28 are dependent claims that depend from independent claims believed to be allowable for at least the reasons discussed above. Claims 6, 7, 13, 14, 20, 21, 27 and 28 are believed to be allowable due to their dependency, as well as for other separate reasons.

Please charge any additional fee occasioned by this paper to our Deposit Account No. 03-1237.

Respectfully submitted,

___/James A. Blanchette/_____
James A. Blanchette
Reg. No. 51,477
CESARI AND MCKENNA, LLP
88 Black Falcon Avenue
Boston, MA 02210-2414
(617) 951-2500